· · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/760,197	ALOISE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. SAYALA	1761
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>C. SAYALA</u> .	(3) Mr John Uren, attorn	<u>ey</u> .
(2) <u>Mr Saxby</u> .	(4) <u>Mr Aloise</u> .	
Date of Interview: 20 August 2003	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  pending		
Claims discussed: 1-15		
Prior art documents discussed:  as applied		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. I of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ</li> </ul>	The examiner will provide a writh e record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
Clark		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)
ı		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant stated that the liquid media acts as "a platform" in providing co-factors for the enzyme. He also stated that the disclosure that the krill hydrolysate provides incomplete hydrolysis was in error in the WO '498. Nonetheless, applicant was informed that the new limitation as to the krill hydrolysate being the liquid media does not occur in the specification, as originally filed. Applicant stated that if the case was found not allowable he will appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. No resolution was reached. An office action will be sent out.